

**To:** Vann, Bradley[Vann.Bradley@epa.gov]  
**From:** Brees, Angela  
**Sent:** Wed 12/30/2015 3:27:53 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Wall Street Journal Inquiry re West Lake--URGENT ATTENTION REQUESTED  
[LeadStudy2015-WestLake.pdf](#)

Hi, Brad.

I have a new request from the WSJ. Any guesses who Chris was working with within the program to answer questions related to Lead-210 and West Lake?

Thanks!

Angela

Angela M. Brees, Deputy Director

Office of Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7

11201 Renner Blvd.

Lenexa, KS 66219

O: 913 - 551-7940

C: 816-663-2707

[brees.angela@epa.gov](mailto:brees.angela@epa.gov)

**From:** Emshwiller, John [mailto:[john.emshwiller@wsj.com](mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 30, 2015 12:54 AM  
**To:** Brees, Angela <[Brees.Angela@epa.gov](mailto:Brees.Angela@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Wall Street Journal Inquiry re West Lake--URGENT ATTENTION REQUESTED

Angela, I am sending this to you at the suggestion of an auto-message from Chris Whitley.  
Regards, John

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Emshwiller, John** <[john.emshwiller@wsj.com](mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com)>

Date: Tue, Dec 29, 2015 at 10:47 PM

Subject: Wall Street Journal Inquiry re West Lake--URGENT ATTENTION REQUESTED

To: [Whitley.christopher@epa.gov](mailto:Whitley.christopher@epa.gov), [Washburn.ben@epa.gov](mailto:Washburn.ben@epa.gov)

Chris,

I am checking back in on the follow-up questions I sent on December 18. I'd appreciate any responses as soon as possible in connection with a story I am doing that could run as early as Wednesday night in the Journal. A new, privately done study just came out that says sampling done in the area around West Lake found relatively high levels of radioactive lead, particularly in homes tested. The authors attribute the lead to radon gas, which decays, after escaping from the West Lake site. I have attached a copy of the report and would like to see if the EPA has any comment on it.

Thanks and regards,

John

PRIOR EMAIL:

Chris,

Thanks. I do have two quick follow-up question based on an email that I just got back from Rene Poche in the press office of the Army Corps of Engineers. Rene said the Corps has a remediation goal for Lead-210 in soil of 5 pCi/g for the top six inches and 15 pCi/g below six inches. The EPA's BMAC report said the the Corps had no remediation goal for Lead-210. I'll ask Rene when this goal came into effect, though I suspect it has been in existence for a number of years, given how long the Corps has been doing clean-up in the St. Louis area. So my questions: one, does the EPA have comment on this possible error in the BMAC report? Two, why would the BMAC report use a potential clean-up trigger for Lead-210 (33.5 pCi/g) that is up to six times higher than the one being used in the St. Louis area by the Corps of Engineers?

Also, it doesn't seem that your colleagues quite addressed my question of why the BMAC report chose a much more lenient risk standard at the St. Louis athletic complex than the EPA chose to use at Fernald. Based on the Fernald standard at least some of the readings at BMAC exceeded what would have been allowed under the EPA's 2.2 pCi/g Fernald standard. Does the EPA have any further comment on this?

Thanks and best,

John

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521